

REMARKS

In the action of March 10, 2010, the examiner again rejected claims 1, 3-12 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as unpatentable over Kuo in view of Meyer and in view of either Gjertsen *et al* or Flick *et al*.

Applicant's attorney has carefully reviewed the office action and the comments of the examiner. Applicant submits a new set of claims, specifically including amended claims 1 and 11, as well as an RCE.

Note that claim 1 has been amended to recite that the stem portion, *i.e.* the combination of the stem body and the core portion, connects to the remainder of the toothbrush. Note that this is not the case for Meyer, nor Kuo, in which element 33 (contractible connector) is a part of the handle.


Note further that claims 1 and 11 recite two channels which extend all the way to the handle plate. Kuo only shows a single "channel" (open neck 31). That "channel" is simply an opening in connector 33 and is not defined by a combination of grooves in a core member and a stem body, as set forth in applicant's claims.

Still further, applicant has defined the extending elements more specifically. The surfaces between the grooves are now defined as outer (claim 1) or inner and outer (claim 11) surfaces. The elements are set forth as "rib elements" which extend from the outer/inner or outer surfaces. This produces a fluid-tight relationship between the two channels. This is clearly different than Meyer, which does not include separate rib elements which extend from the "extending surfaces" of the examiner's drawing. There is no comparable structure in Meyer to produce the described fluid-tight relationship.

Accordingly, claims 1 and 11 are patentable over the cited references. Since the remaining claims are all dependent upon either claim 1 or claim 11, they are also allowable. Allowance of the application is now respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

JENSEN & PUNTIGAM, P.S.

By 

Clark A. Puntigam #25,763
Attorney for Applicant